

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please insert attached Figures 1-8.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 14-16, 22, 24 and 28-32 are canceled.

Support for each amended claim is found at the originally filed claims and throughout the originally filed specification.

No new matter has been added.

Applicants have furnished Figures 1-8 in response to the Office's request for drawings.

The specification objection, based on lack of section headings, is obviated by the amendments to the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the specification rejection based on Claim 27.

Applicants note that page 8, lines 28-30, describes that "provision is made for at least one of the elements or at least two of the elements that make up the diffusing layer to be electronically conducting." Applicants submit this language provides proper basis for Claim 27. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The objections to Claims 3, 5-7, 17-18 and 20-24 are obviated by amendments to the claims.

The anticipation rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-27, 29-30, 32 and 34, as being unpatentable over Jinnai, is respectfully traversed, because Jinnai does not describe or suggest all of the features of the present claims, and in fact teaches away from a claim feature.

The present claims describe, in part, a diffusing layer comprising a mineral particle layer comprising a mineral binder. The claim feature is not described or suggested by Jinnai.

As described in the Official Action at page 9, and in Jinnai at paragraphs 59, 70, 76, and 87, the light scattering layer of Jinnai is based on resin [binder], which is clearly an

organic resin (see paragraph 76 of Jinnai, describing various organic resins as preferred embodiments). Because the present claims have, as a feature, a mineral binder, and Jinnai describes a resin [binder] that is organic in nature, Jinnai cannot anticipate the present claims. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 6, 28 and 31, as being unpatentable over Jinnai is respectfully traversed.

As previously discussed, a feature of Claim 6 is a diffusing layer comprising a mineral particle layer comprising a miner binder. This feature is not described or suggested by Jinnai, and Jinnai “teaches away from” this feature. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 12-13 as being unpatentable over Jinnai in view of Suzuki is respectfully traversed. As previously discussed, a feature of Claims 12-13 is a diffusing layer comprising a mineral particle layer comprising a mineral binder. This feature is not described or suggested by Jinnai, and Jinnai “teaches away from” this feature. Suzuki, in adding particle sizes, does not remedy the deficiency of Suzuki. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The obviousness rejection of Claims 33 and 35 as being unpatentable over Jinnai in view of Hasegawa is respectfully traversed. As previously discussed, a feature of Claims 33 and 35 is a diffusing layer comprising a mineral particle layer comprising a mineral binder. This feature is not described or suggested by Jinnai. Hasegawa, in adding a lamp, does not remedy the deficiency of Jinnai. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/518,531
Reply to Office Action of June 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Charles J. Andres Jr., Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)